REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The present application discloses a method and computer program product for reading an encoded cable speed/length value contained within an interconnection cable to set the interconnection speed of two or more components connected by the interconnection cable within a computing environment. More specifically, the method detects changes to the cable connections within the I/O fabric of the computing environment, and autonomically reconfigures the connected components to enable the interconnected devices to communicate at the maximum effective bandwidth, based on the length of the interconnection cables utilized.

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested. Claims 16 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-17 remain pending in this application.

In section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objects to the form of the subheading on page 1, line2. Applicants have amended the subheading to address the Examiner's concerns.

In section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C.§ 112 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 16 and 17 have been amended to address the Examiner's concerns and thereby overcome this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 16 and 17, as amended, are not indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kopelovitz et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0138604) in view of Faddell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,938,742). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Kopelovitz et al. features at least one user attribute, which associates at least one transport medium component with the main path and which is preferably stored in a database (Kopelovitz

et al., paragraph 72). **Preferably, the user attribute is entered manually by the user** (Kopelovitz et al., paragraph 72). A domain network management system (NMS) then receives an instruction to determine the alternate path according to the user attribute. (Kopelovitz et al., paragraph 72).

In contrast to Kopelovitz et al., the present invention does not require a user to manually enter a user attribute (e.g., cable identifier). Instead, the present invention utilizes an interface speed adjustment mechanism (Figure 1, element 54) to automatically read the cable identifier information from an interconnection cable (Figure 1, element 113). In fact, the interface speed adjustment mechanism (Figure 1, element 54) further stores the cable identifier in a software object within the computing environment, and automatically adjusts ports speeds of components connected by the interconnection cable based on the cable identifier. In other words, all of these steps are automatically performed by the present invention, requiring no user intervention, with the necessary attributes (e.g., cable identifier) inherently present within the interconnection cable itself.

Thus, Kopelovitz et al. is missing the necessary step of "reading a cable identifier of an interconnection cable connecting components in the computing environment", as provided in independent claims 1 and 10.

Applicants also respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-5, 8-13, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) with regard to Faddell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,938,742). Faddell et al. also is missing the necessary step of "reading a cable identifier of an interconnection cable connecting components in the in the computing environment", as provided in independent claims 1 and 10.

For these reasons, Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable in view of Kopelovitz et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0138604) in view of Faddell et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,938,742). Since claims 2-5, 8-9, 11-13, 16 and 17 rely, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 and 10, claims 2-5, 8-9, 11-13, 16 and 17 are also now submitted as allowable.

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner specifically rejects claims 2 and 3, stating that while Kopelovitz et al. does not teach that the method is triggered upon system bring-up and during run time, Faddell et al. teaches that the method is triggered upon system bring-up (power-up; col. 2, lines 30-42) and during run time (hot plugging; col. 2, lines 25-30).

Applicant respectfully submits that the method, as provided in claim 1, is not disclosed nor suggested by either the Kopelovitz et al. reference or the Faddell et al. reference. More specifically, neither reference provides the necessary method step of "reading a cable identifier of an interconnection cable connecting components in the in the computing environment" as claimed in the present invention. Thus, while Faddell et al. may describe triggering a method upon system bring-up or during run time, the method is not the method as claimed in the present invention. As a result, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 3 are in condition for allowance.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner specifically rejects claims 4 and 5, stating that Kopelovitz et al. teaches the method, wherein the cable identifier contains the length of the cable (length of the fiber; paragraph 0027) and the type of the associated interconnection cable (paragraph 0024).

Applicant respectfully submits that the length of the fiber described in paragraph 0027 of Kopelovitz et al. and the type of the associated interconnection cable described in paragraph 0024 of Kopelovitz et al. are provided in user attributes. As stated on page 5, paragraph 72 of the Kopelovitz et al. reference, "Preferably, the user attribute is entered manually by the user." Thus, while the present invention stores the attributes of the cable within the cable itself via a cable identifier, and these cable attributes are then automatically read by a software application (e.g., interface speed adjustment mechanism), Kopelovitz et al. does not store the cable attributes within the cable itself, rather it requires that a user manually enter the attributes into the system. Thus, neither Kopelovitz et al. nor Faddell et al. provide the necessary method step of "reading a cable identifier of an interconnection cable connecting components in the in the computing

environment" as claimed in the present invention. As a result, Applicants submit that claims 4 and 5 are in condition for allowance.

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 8 and 9 and states that Kopelovitz et al. teaches a method, wherein at least one of components is a logically partitioned computer system (database; abstract) and is an I/O enclosure (any one of I/O in a node of a network; paragraph 0002).

Applicants respectfully submit that neither the database nor abstract discloses or suggests a logically partitioned computer system as described in the present invention. Applicants further submit that paragraph 2 provides only a broad, background discussion of networking, and makes no specific reference to I/O enclosures as claimed in the present invention. As a result, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 9 are in condition for allowance.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claim 10, stating that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Kopelovitz et al and Faddell et al. because that would provide serial bus to reconfigure attached peripheral device without any action on the part of the user (col. 7, lines 5-17).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion. As previously stated, paragraph 72 of Kopelovitz et al. states that: "Preferably, the user attribute is entered manually by the user". Thus, in contrast to the present invention, Kopelovitz et al. is not able to directly read a cable identifier (i.e., user attributes) directly from the cable itself, but requires a user to manually input this information into the system. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 10 of the present invention is now in condition for allowance.

In paragraph 9 of the present invention, the Examiner states that claims 11-13, 16, and 17 are rejected on the grounds that Kopelovitz et al and Faddell et al. in combination teach apparatus as set forth in claims 2-4, 8, and 9.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-13, 16, and 17 are allowable for the same reasons previously set forth with regard to claims 2-4, 8, and 9. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 11-13, 16, and 17 are now in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing comments and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims (i.e., claims 1-17) are in condition for allowance and that the application should be passed to issue. The Examiner is urged to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if, in the Examiner's opinion, such a phone conference would expedite or aid in the prosecution of this application.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on

August 24, 2005
(Date of Deposit)

Debra A. Peterson

Debra A. Peterson

Respectfully submitted,

By: James R Nock

James R. Nock, Attorney
Attorney Reg. No.: 42,937
IBM Corporation, Dept 917
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829
Telephone: (507) 253-4661